



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/509,040 | 03/14/2005 | Mirko Lehmann | Micronas.7605 | 3246 |
| 50811 | 7590 | 01/29/2009 | | |
| O'Shea Getz P.C. 1500 MAIN ST. SUITE 912 SPRINGFIELD, MA 01115 | | | EXAMINER DOE, SHANTA G | |
| | | | ART UNIT 1797 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 01/29/2009 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/509,040 | Applicant(s) LEHMANN ET AL. | |
| | Examiner SHANTA G. DOE | Art Unit 1797 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/19/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 2/19/2008 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's argument that the combination reference (Duveneck and Rokugawa) fails to teach a device for detecting a cellular metabolic process comprising one of a biological cell metabolizing excitation source and a chemical cell metabolizing excitation source connected to an inlet... luminescence signal was not found persuasive because the applicant did not claim the above limitation in the response dated 2/19/2008, and in addition the rejections were made in reference to the claims presented in the 2/19/2008 response. The applicant's argument that Schurmann-Mader (WO2001/043875) is not prior art because the applicant's present application claims priority to two patent application filed with the European Patent office EPO namely EPO application No. 02006978.7 filed March 27, 2002 and EPO application No. 02016793.8 filed July 27, 2002 and thus the effective U.S. filing date for the applicant's present application is at least as early as July 26, 2002 was not found persuasive. The above argument was not found persuasive because according to MPEP (see MPEP1893.03 (b), (c)) the effective U.S. filing date of a 371 national stage application is the international filing date of the PCT hence the effective US filing date of the applicant's present application is March 5, 2003 and not July 26 2002, additionally Schurmann-Mader (WO2001/043875) was published on June 21, 2001 which makes it 102(b)/103 art (Schurmann-Mader (US 2002/0182631) was used as the English language equivalent and not the actual prior art reference). Finally, the applicant's

Art Unit: 1797

argument that the Duveneck reference teaches a measuring method of the device...

and hence one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Rokugawa with the device of Duveneck was not found persuasive because the Duveneck reference was used to reject a device claimed by the applicant and not a measuring method of the device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed subject matter which was not described in the specification at the time the application was filed is the device for detecting a cellular metabolic process comprising one of a biological metabolizing excitation source and a chemical cell metabolizing excitation source connected to the inlet.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1797

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The above claims are indefinite because the examiner is not sure what exactly a “biological cell metabolizing excitation source” and/or a “chemical cell metabolizing excitation source” are and additionally the above phrases/limitations were not described in the specification. For examination purposes, the examiner interprets the above phrase to mean a source containing chemical/biological excitation medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

Art Unit: 1797

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1, 2, and 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059).

Regarding claim 1, Duveneck disclose a device for detecting a luminescence event in, at, or in the immediate vicinity of a cell, a cell cluster, or a tissue, said device comprising: having

(a) a carrier element (76) with a surface (7) prepared for direct or indirect coupling of cells,

(b) a detector (detection unit 4 in the form of a photodiode) for receiving a luminescence signal indicative of the luminescent event, where the detector is integrated into the carrier element below surface,

(c) a cover (2) covering surface covering the prepared surface to form a cavity(68), the cover having an inlet opening(64) and an outlet opening(66), and

(d) an excitation source containing chemical/biological excitation medium (liquid containing luminophore or luminescence substance to be detected) which flows through the inlet opening (64).(see Duveneck fig 1 and 8, col. 5 lines 13- 27, 53-58 line65 - col.

Art Unit: 1797

6 line 14, col. 6 lines 48 - lines 67; col. 7 lines 5 -12, col. 8 lines 26 - 38, col. 17 lines 59 - 67, col. 19 lines 25 -59, col. 21 lines 10 - 14, lines 42 - 56 and col. 22 lines 15-20).

However, Duveneck fails to disclose an excitation source connected to the inlet opening of the device. Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) discloses a device for detecting luminescence where in an excitation source (12) containing biological/chemical excitation medium and connected to the inlet opening (see Rokugawa fig 1 col. 2 lines 17 - 28, col. 3 lines 21 - col. 4 line 68). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the excitation source be connected to the inlet opening of the device of Duveneck as taught by Rokugawa since it was known in the art at the time to do so and furthermore, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art.

Additionally, the phrase “ accepting a biological or chemical excitation medium that includes a luminophore, where the excitation medium influences the metabolism of the cell during excitation thereof...the luminescence signal “ is intend use of the excitation source and phrase does not further limit the claim and the device as claimed is capable of the applicants intended use.

Regarding claim 2, the combined reference as applied to claim 1 above discloses the device according to claim 1 in which a optical filter (636) is located between prepared surface (609) and the optical detector (604) (see Duveneck col. 16 lines 46 - 62).

Regarding claim 4, the combined reference as applied to claim 1 discloses the device of claim 1, in which multiple detectors are integrated into carrier element below the surface prepared for coupling the cells (see Duveneck fig. 1(detection unit could be an array of detector) fig 5, col. 5 lines 53 - 56; col. 6 lines 48 - 49; col. 13 lines 21 - 31)

Regarding claim 5, the combined reference as applied to claim 4, disclose the device according to claim 4, in which detector comprises a photodiode (see Duveneck col. 6 lines 48 - 49).

Regarding claim 6, the combined reference as applied to claim 1 discloses device according to claim 1, comprising an evaluation circuit (circuits for driving the photoelectric detectors (detector which detects light / luminescence intensity and converts it into corresponding electrical signals and a measurement of the activity on the sensing surface is obtained or evaluated) connected to at least one detector (see Duveneck col. 3 lines 42 - 44 and lines 50 -52).

Regarding claim 7, the combined reference as applied to claim 6 above discloses the device of claim 6, in which the evaluation circuit is integrated into the carrier element (the circuit for driving the detector are produces on the same substrate (carrier); see Duveneck col. 3 lines 42 - 44 and lines 50 -52).

Regarding claim 8, the combined reference as applied to claim 6 above discloses the device of claim 6. The combined reference fails to disclose the device of claim 6 in which the excitation source controlled by the evaluation circuit tends the chemical or biological substance to the inlet opening (8). Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) further discloses a biosensor having a source (12) controlled by a circuit (control valve (8)) to send substance from the source (12) to an inlet opening (see Rokugawa fig., col. 3 lines 20 -23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the excitation source be controlled by the circuit of the combined reference as taught by Rokugawa in order to make dispensing of substance from the source automated and further more since, it was well known in the art at the time to have a source be controlled by a circuit.

Regarding claim 9, the combined reference as applied to claim 8 discloses the device according to claim 8. The combined reference fails to disclose the device of claim 8, in which a valve is disposed in an inlet line between the excitation source and inlet opening to control the supply of medium. Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) further discloses a biosensor having a source (12), a control valve (8) disposed between the source (12) and the inlet (see Rokugawa fig., col. 3 lines 20 -23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a valve disposed between the inlet and the source of the combined reference as taught by Rokugawa, since, Rokugawa states on lines 22 -23 that such a modification would aid in the

Art Unit: 1797

regulation of the quantity of the substance from the source that is added/dispensed to the inlet.

Regarding claim 10, the combined reference as applied to claim 1 above discloses the device according to claim 1, wherein an adhesion matrix (adhesion promoting layer is applied to a waveguide surface) and/or a growth substrate for cells is applied to the surface (see Duveneck col. 18 lines 50 - 52).

6. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sieben et al (US 6,104,495).

Regarding claim 3, the combined reference as applied to claim 1 above discloses the device of claim 1. However, the combined reference fails to disclose the device of claim 1 in which the carrier element is a semiconductor body. Sieben et al (US 6,104,495) discloses a device for detecting signals related to chemical or physiological condition in cells immobilized on a sensing surface attached to semiconductor body (semiconductor material) carrier (see Sieben abs, col. 1 line 53 - col. 2 line 7; col. 3 lines 8 - 24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a semiconductor body as the carrier element in the device of the combined reference as taught by Sieben, since, Sieben states at col. 3 lines 11-13 that

Art Unit: 1797

such a modification would allow for the use of conventional fabrication processes for integrated circuit on the carrier.

7. Claims 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Schurmann-Mader et al (WO 2001/043875) .

Regarding claim 12, the combined references disclose the device according to claim 1 in which an immobilizing medium (8) is applied to the surface (7). However, the combined references fail to specifically teach that a cell-immobilizing medium is applied to surface. Schurmann-Mader (see US 2002/0182631 for English language equivalent) discloses that it is known in the art to apply cell-immobilizing medium to a sensing surface (a layer is deposited on the surface (base plate) for the immobilization of biological recognition elements such a whole cells or fragments of cells) (see the US equivalent case (US 2002/0182631) of Schurmann-Mader paragraph [0052] and [0054]). It would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the to have an immobilizing medium be a cell immobilizing medium as taught by Schurmann-Mader since it was known in the art at the time to use such immobilizing medium on a sensing surface.

Regarding claim 14, the combined references as applied to claim 1 above, disclose the device according to claim 1 wherein chemical or biochemical recognition element are

Art Unit: 1797

immobilized on the sensing surface. However, the combined references fail to disclose the device of claim 1 wherein at least one cell (6) is immobilized at the surface.

Schurmann-Mader discloses that it is known in the art to immobilize biological or biochemical recognition elements such as whole cells on sensing surfaces (see US equivalent case (US 2002/0182631) of Schurmann-Mader paragraph [0054]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to immobilize at least one cell on the surface of the combined references as taught by Schurmann-Mader since it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to do so.

8. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) as applied to claim 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Parce et al (5,278,048).

Regarding claim 11, the combined references as applied to claim 10 above, disclose the device according to claim 10. However, the combined references fail to disclose the device of claim 10 in which the growth substrate comprises gelatin. Parce (5,278,048) discloses a detecting/sensing device in which non-adherent cells may be grown on the surface of the sensor by mixing the cell with gelatin and then applying the mixture to the surface of the silicon sensor. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a substrate such as gelatin in the device of the combined references as taught by Parce, since Parce states such substrates aid in

Art Unit: 1797

adhesion of living cells to the sensing chamber and cells can be grown on such substrate (see col. 5 line s 60-co1.6 lines 11)

Regarding claim 15, the combined references as applied to claim 1 disclose the device according to claim 1. However, the combined reference fail to disclose the device of claim 1 in which a depression is created in the surface of the carrier device prepared for receiving cells, by contrast with surface areas (101) not prepared for receiving cells, said depression being preferably at least 100 nm deep. Parce (5,278,048) discloses a detecting/sensing device in which a flow chamber has a surface with plurality of wells or depression. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create depressions on carrier surface of the combined references device as taught by Parce since Parce states at col. 2 lines 41-43 that such a modification would act to physically trap the living cell onto the surface by gravitational sedimentation. Further more, Parce discloses that the wells/depression should be of a sufficient width and depth to enable cells to remain in the chamber during ordinary flow rates (Parce col. 2 lines 44 - 46). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the depressions be at least 100 nm deep, since it has been held that were the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck

Art Unit: 1797

(US 6,469,785) in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) and Schurmann-Mader et al (WO 2001/043875) as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Ikeda et al (US 5,582,697).

Regarding claim 13, the combined references as applied to claim 12 disclose the device according to claim 12. However, the combined references fail to disclose the device of claim 12 in which the medium comprises negatively charged polystyrene. Ikeda (US 5,582,697) discloses that it is known in the art to use negatively charged polystyrene (polystyrene sulfonate) as an immobilization medium. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use negatively charge polystyrene as the immobilizing medium as taught by Ikeda since is known in the art for it hydrophilic properties.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schurmann-Mader et al (WO 2001/043875) in view of Chappelle et al (US 4385113).

Regarding claim 16, Schurman-Mader discloses a method for detection of a luminescence event using a sensor, at, or in the immediate vicinity of a cell, a cell cluster, or a tissue, comprising: Immobilization of the cell at the surface prepared for receiving cells, introduction of a luminophore (luminescent dye or a luminescent nanoparticle) in the vicinity of the cell, stimulation of the cell by a chemical or biological

Art Unit: 1797

substance (the analyte), and detection of a luminescence signal (see the US equivalent case (US 2002/0182631) of Schurmann-Mader paragraphs [0011],[0017],[0023],[0028], [0054], [0106], [0122], [00127]). Schurmann- Mader fails to disclose the method of detecting a luminescence event wherein there is an induction of a luminophore, which reacts with a cell metabolic product in the cell or in the vicinity of the cell. However, Chappelle (US 4385113) discloses a method of detecting luminescence comprising inducing a luminophore (luciferase-luciferin mixture), which reacts with the cell or bacteria metabolic product (ATP) resulting in a light/luminescence reaction related to the amount of ATP present (see Chappelle abs, col. 2 lines 41-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the introduction of luminophore step include introducing a luminophore reacting with the cell metabolic product in the vicinity of the cell as taught by Chappelle in order to enable the sensor to measure the effect of cell affecting agent on the metabolic rate of the immobilized cell.

Regarding claim 17, the combined references as applied to claim 16 above disclose the method according to claim (15) 16, in which the luminescence signal is detected with temporal resolution (emission light from the measurement is measure time-resolved) (see the US equivalent case (US 2002/0182631) Schurmann-Mader paragraph [0019]).

10. Claims 18, 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Sieben et al (US 6,104,495).

Art Unit: 1797

Regarding 18 and 22, Duveneck does disclose a device for detecting a cellular metabolic process associated with a cell by detecting a luminescence event in, at, or in the immediate vicinity of the cell, the device comprising: an immobilized surface or prepared surface, a detector for providing a luminescence signal indicative of the luminescent event, where the detector is integrated into the device below the cell; a cover that covers the prepared surface to form a cavity, the cover having an inlet and an outlet; and an excitation source that provides to the cavity via the inlet a biological or chemical excitation medium that includes a luminophore.(see Duveneck fig 1 and 8, col. 5 lines 13- 27, 53-58 line65 - col. 6 line 14, col. 6 lines 48 - lines 67; col. 7 lines 5 -12, col. 8 lines 26 - 38, col. 17 lines 59 - 67, col. 19 lines 25 -59, col. 21 lines 10 - 14, lines 42 - 56 and col. 22 lines 15-20).

The Duveneck reference fails to disclose that the device comprises a semiconductive device with the surface prepared for coupling the cell thereto.

Sieben et al (US 6,104,495) discloses a device for detecting signals related to chemical or physiological condition in cells immobilized on a sensing surface attached to semiconductor body (semiconductor material) carrier (see Sieben abs, col. 1 line 53 - col. 2 line 7; col. 3 lines 8 - 24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a semiconductor body as the carrier element in the device of the Duveneck reference as taught by Sieben, since, Sieben states at col. 3 lines 11-13 that such a modification would allow for the use of conventional fabrication processes for integrated circuit on the carrier.

Art Unit: 1797

The above phrase "excitation medium influences the metabolism of the cell during excitation thereof by the medium, and where the luminophore reacts with a metabolic product of the cell during the excitation thereof to provide luminescence detected by the detector" is an intended use and does not further limit the claim.

Regarding claim 19, the combined references disclose the device of claim 18, further comprising an optical filter located between the prepared surface and the optical detector, and where a plurality of optical detectors are integrated into the semiconductive substrate below the prepared surface (see Duveneck fig 1 and 8, col. 5 lines 13- 27, 53-58 line 65 - col. 6 line 14, col. 6 lines 48 - lines 67; col. 7 lines 5 -12, col. 8 lines 26 - 38, col. 17 lines 59 - 67, col. 19 lines 25 -59, col. 21 lines 10 - 14, lines 42 - 56 and col. 22 lines 15-20) .

11. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of Sieben et al (US 6,104,495) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Rokugawa (US 4,621,059).

Regarding claim 20, the combined references of Duveneck and Sieben disclose the device of claim 18. The combined references fail to disclose the device of claim 18 in which the excitation source controlled by the evaluation circuit sends the chemical or biological substance to the inlet opening (8). Rokugawa (US 4,621,059) further discloses a biosensor having a source (12) controlled by a circuit (control valve (8)) to

Art Unit: 1797

send substance from the source (12) to an inlet opening (see Rokugawa fig., col. 3 lines 20 -23). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the excitation source be controlled by the circuit of the combined reference as taught by Rokugawa in order to make dispensing of substance from the source automated and further more since, it was well known in the art at the time to have a source be controlled by a circuit.

12. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duveneck (US 6,469,785) in view of in view of Sieben et al (US 6,104,495) as applied to claim 18, and further in view of Schurmann-Mader et al (WO 2001/043875).

Regarding claim 21, the combined references of Duveneck and Sieben disclose the device according to claim 18 in which an immobilizing medium (8) is applied to the surface (7). However, the combined reference fails to specifically teach that a cell-immobilizing medium is applied to surface. Schurmann-Mader (WO 2001/043875) discloses that it is known in the art to apply cell-immobilizing medium to a sensing surface (a layer is deposited on the surface (base plate) for the immobilization of biological recognition elements such a whole cells or fragment of cells) (see the equivalent US Schurmann-Mader case (US 2002/0182631) paragraph [0052] and [0054] for English translation of WO). It would have been obvious to having ordinary skill in the art at the to have a immobilizing medium be a cell immobilizing medium as taught

Art Unit: 1797

by Schurmann-Mader, since it was known in the art at the time to use such immobilizing medium on a sensing surface.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHANTA G. DOE whose telephone number is (571)270-3152. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Walter Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1797

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GSD

/Walter D. Griffin/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797